



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

[Handwritten Signature]

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/421,771	10/19/1999	JACK REGULA	136.1001.04	4583
22883	7590	04/19/2004	EXAMINER	
SWERNOFSKY LAW GROUP PC			PATEL, AJIT	
P.O. BOX 390013			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94039-0013			2664	<i>[Handwritten Signature]</i>
DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/421,771	REGULA, JACK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AJIT G. PATEL	2664	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 91-154 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. ·
- 5) Claim(s) 99-107,122-135 and 149-153 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 91-98,108-121,136-148,154 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

Art Unit: 2664

1. Claim 132 should depend on claim 128 or 131 to provide the antecedent base in claim.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 91-98,111,113-116,121,139,141-144,154 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hutchison et al (5,327,534).108-110,112,117-120,138,140-148

Regarding claim 91,95, Hutchison et al disclose a multiport LAN bridge incorporating the steps of capturing the address from the bus (lines 25-49, col. 9); converting the address into a value stored in the routing tag (lines 25-49, col. 9).

Regarding claim 92, 96, Hutchison et al disclose the step of accessing the value from a first address memory (fAMCAM) after assertion of the address to the fAMCAM (lines 25-32, col. 9).

Regarding claim 93,97, Hutchison et al disclose the fAMCAM comprises a first register that defines an address window on the bus (lines 25-49, col. 9).

Regarding claim 94,98, Hutchison et al disclose the step of storing a configuration value in the first register (lines 40-57, col. 5); broadcasting the configuration value to the second node for storage in the second register (lines 40-57, col. 5).

Art Unit: 2664

Regarding claim 111,139, Hutchison et al disclose the limitation of sending a response cell by second node to the first node (lines 105, col. 3; lines 39-47, col. 3).

Regarding claim 113,141, Hutchison et al disclose the limitation of “generating at least one transfer attribute from the bus operation and including the at least one transfer attribute within the cell” (lines 52-64, col. 3).

Regarding claim 114,142, Hutchison et al disclose the limitation of “the cell is read-initiate cell, an interrupt transition cell, a read response cell, a write-initiate cell, or a write-response cell” (fig. 8).

Regarding claim 116,144 Hutchison et al disclose the limitation of “automatically initializing the fAMCAM responsive to one or more operations on the bus” (lines 34-66, col. 12).

Regarding claim 121,154, Hutchison et al disclose the limitation of “determining whether the value identifies the host node and broadcasting the cell dependent on the step of determining when the value does not identify the host node” (lines 40-51, col. 5).

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2664

5. Claims 108-110,112,117-120,138,140-148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hutchison et al in view of Caspi et al (5,546,385).

Regarding claims 110, 112, 117, 138, 140, 145, the bus of Hutchison et al fail to disclose that the bus is PCI bus. Caspi et al disclose a communication system which comprises PCI bus which connects the peripheral components for communication among a variety of input/output components such as communication and graphics co-processors. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use PCI bus as taught by Caspi et al in the communication system of Hutchison et al for connecting the users for communication.

Regarding claims 119,120,147,148, Hutchison et al fail to disclose sliding window technique. The sliding window technique is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use sliding window technique in the system of Hutchison et al in order to control the flow of data.

Claim # 29 107-121-17-2-15 Date received 10-16-00 Status better by 10-20-00 reported back
claim, by 10-20-00. Received information denied. Rejected on 01-01-01 as
base claim and my issue - no grounds.

6. Claims 99-107,122-135,149-153 are allowed.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 1/26/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argued that the Hutchinson does not teach the step of converting address into a value stored in the routing tag. However the above limitation is interpreted as mapping the address (lines 25-49, col.9) as indicated in the specification of the instant application. Also, it is noted that the bus is interpreted as a connection or wire or cable which is taught by the Hutchinson. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use PCI bus as taught by Caspi et al in the communication system of Hutchinson et al for connecting the users for communication. Also, it is noted that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use sliding widow technique in the system of Hutchinson et al in order to control the flow of data.

Art Unit: 2664

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AJIT G. PATEL whose telephone number is 703-308-5347. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 703-305-4366. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AP

Ajit Patel
Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner